REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on November 13, 2008. At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-28 were pending in this patent application. Claims 1, 15 and 21 have been amended for the purpose of clarity. Support for the amendments can be found in paragraphs 47-49 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-9, 11, 15-17, 20-23, and 25, of which claims 1, 15 and 21 are the only independent claim, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Christopherson et al.*, U.S. Publication No. 2002/10095595 ("Christopherson") view of in view of the printed publication "Log files: an Extended File Service Exploiting Write-Once Storage" by *Finlayson et al.*, hereinafter ("Finlayson"). The Examiner also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopherson and Finlayson as applied to claim 2, further in view of the web article "Using XML Based Configuration File in Windows Form Applications" authored by Daniel, Olson. The Examiner also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopherson and Finlayson, as applied to claim 2, further in view of the printed publication "Wi-Fi Protected Access: Strong, Standards-Based, Interoperable Security for Today's Wi-Fi Networks" prepared by Wi-Fi Alliance on April 29,2003. The Examiner also rejected claims 12-14, 18, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopherson and Finlayson as applied to claim 1, further in view of *Takenaka* U.S. Patent No. 6,411,829 ("Takenaka"). The Examiner also rejected claims 10, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopherson and Finlayson as applied to claims 1 and 21 above respectively, further in view of "IBM 8MB USB Memory Key - User's Guide" published by IBM on 2000, ("IBM USB"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, and the assertions and determinations therein, for at least the following reasons and requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claims 1-6 and 8-14

Amended claim 1 recites a method of configuring a thin client computing device for operation in a network. The method, in part, includes "uploading […] configuration data from the portable media device to the thin client computing device" and "[configuring] the thin client computing device using the uploaded configuration data and without using the

portable media device." Nothing in Christopherson teaches or suggest "uploading [...]
configuration data from the portable media device to the thin client computing device" and
"[configuring] the thin client computing device using the uploaded configuration data and
without using the portable media device." Finlayson does not cure the deficiencies of
Christopherson because nothing in Finlayson teaches or suggests "uploading [...]
configuration data from the portable media device to the thin client computing device" and
"[configuring] the thin client computing device using the uploaded configuration data and
without using the portable media device," and neither is Finlayson used for that by the
Examiner.

Christopherson describes a client computer that may store configuration parameters
on a removable medium so that a user can take the removable medium to different client
computers and use the same configuration parameters. However, Christopherson does not
teaches uploading the configuration parameters from the portable medium to the client
computer and configuring the client computer using the uploaded configuration parameters
and without using the portable medium itself. Instead, Christopherson explicitly states that
the client computer uses configuration parameters in the portable medium during
initialization, for example. *See Christopherson*, paragraph 44. Accordingly, nothing in
Christopherson teaches or suggest "***uploading*** [...] configuration data from the portable
media device to the thin client computing device" and "[configuring] the thin client
computing device using the uploaded configuration data and ***without using the portable
media*** device."

Furthermore, Christopherson discloses a user-based technique for controlling access
to and/or modification of the configuration parameters of a client computer that aims to
prevent unauthorized access to and/or modification of these parameters. Therefore,
modifying Christopherson to allow users to individually upload their configuration
parameters from their removable disks to different client computers would be contrary to the
purpose of Christopherson. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify
Christopherson to include "uploading [...] configuration data from the portable media device
to the thin client computing device" and "[configuring] the thin client computing device
using the uploaded configuration data and without using the portable media device."

The pending claim 1 is a patentable improvement over the cited Christopherson reference, especially with respect to thin clients. One of the useful features of thin clients is that they are portable, and Christopherson's requirement that a removable disk be attached to a thin client while the thin client is operating would diminish this feature, even if the removable disk is relatively small. Moreover, for multiple thin clients to operate simultaneously, Christopher would require multiple removable disks. This would generally lead to an inefficient use of resource.

Claim 1 addresses this issue by proposing that the removable device is used only to configure the thin client. After the thin client is configured, the thin client can operate without using any data that is stored on the removable device, and the removable device can be used for other purposes. For at least this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 and 8-14 are allowable.

Claims 15-20

Amended claim 15 includes similar features to those discussed in reference to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20 are allowable the reasons discussed in reference to claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 15 recites "identifying a portion of the configuration data on the portable media device that is relevant to the thin client computing device [and] uploading only the identified portion of the configuration data from the portable media device to the thin client." Nothing in Christopherson teaches or suggests this feature, and neither is this feature in Finlayson.

Furthermore, claim 15 recites "disconnecting the portable media device from the thin client computing device" after uploading configuration data from the portable media device to the thin client and before configuring the thin client. Nothing in Christopherson teaches or suggests this feature. In fact, Christopherson teaches away from this feature because, as explained in reference to claim 1, Christopherson's client computer uses configuration parameters in the portable medium during initialization, for example.

The pending claim 15 is a patentable improvement over the cited Christopherson reference, especially in the context of thin clients. One of the useful features of thin clients is

that they are portable, and Christopherson's requirement that a removable disk be attached to a client computer while the computer is operating would diminish this feature of a thin client, even if the removable disk is relatively small. Moreover, for multiple thin clients to operate simultaneously, Christopher would require multiple removable disks. This would generally lead to an inefficient use of resource.

Claim 1 addresses this issue by proposing that the removable device is used only to configure the thin client. After the thin client is configured, the removable device can be disconnected. The thin client can operate without using any data that is stored on the removable device, and the removable device can be used for other purposes. For at least this reason, claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20 are allowable.

Claims 21-28

Amended claim 21 includes similar features to those discussed in reference to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20 are allowable for the reasons discussed in reference to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and arguments, the applicant submits the pending application is in condition for allowance and an early action so indicating is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 30835/306246, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 13, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

By_/W. J. Kramer #46,229/_____
William J. Kramer
   Registration No.: 46,229
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant

10